

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

REGINALD FULLARD,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	1:20CV100
	)	
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,	)	
et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendant(s).	)	

**ORDER**

The Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, (ECF No. 7) ,was filed with the court in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and, on March 23, 2020, was served on the parties in this action. Plaintiff objected to the Recommendation. (ECF No. 9.)

The Court has appropriately reviewed the portions of the Magistrate Judge’s report to which objection was made and has made a *de novo* determination which is in accord with the Magistrate Judge’s report. The Court therefore adopts the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation.

Additionally, in his filing, Plaintiff makes two requests that are beyond the scope of typical objections. (ECF No. 9 at 3-4.) First, he seeks appointment of counsel. (*Id.* at 3.) Second, he seeks an injunction barring prison authorities from “conduct that prevent [sic] access to the courts,” giving him access to legal property, and allowing additional access to carbon paper or photo copier services. (*Id.* at 3-4.) These are denied as this matter will not proceed any further.

The Magistrate Judge has previously recommended *sua sponte* dismissal of this action due because Plaintiff has not paid the filing fee and is barred from proceeding *in forma pauperis* unless he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury. (ECF Nos. 3 at 2.) The Court adopted that recommendation, (ECF No. 5), and in this Order, declines Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, (ECF No. 6). Neither appointment of counsel nor injunctive relief is warranted because it does not alter the Recommendation of the United States Magistrate or the Judgment.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, (ECF No. 6), is DENIED.

This, the 9<sup>th</sup> day of April 2020.

/s/ Loretta C. Biggs  
United States District Judge